## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ROBERT H. LUND,

Appellant

= vs-

ICNAS, Trustee

Appellee .

## PETITION FOR RE-HEARING

APPEAL FROM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL DIVISION,
HON. M. D. CROCKER, DISTRICT JUDGE

John R. Brunner Attorney at Law Sovereign Building 354 West Ocean Boulevard Long Beach 2, California



	No. 18769
2	
;	
4	IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
	FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
6	
7	ROBERT H. LUND,
8	Appellant
9	-vs-
10	SAM JONAS, Trustee,
11	APPELLEE
12	
13	PETITION FOR RE-HEARING
14	
15	TO THE HONORABLE PRESIDING JUDGE AND TO THE HONORABLE
16	ASSOCIATE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR
17	THE NINTH CIRCUIT:
18	Appellant Robert H. Lund respectfully petitions this
19	Honorable Court for a re-hearing of its order granting
20	appellee's motion to dismiss the appeal in the above en-
21	titled cause rendered on the twenty-third day of December,
22	1963, and in support of his petition respectfully states:
23	The within appeal presents the question of whether
24	an attorney, who has not been authorized by his clients to
25	do so, may be required to reveal the names and addresses of
26	clients in an action to which the clients are strangers.
	-1-



1	This question is of such grave concern to the legal
2	profession and to the public at large that it should not
3	be permitted to turn on the negligence of the appellant's
4	attorney to prepare, serve, and file the appellant's open
5	brief within the time prescribed by law.
6	It is respectfully submitted that your Honorable
7	Court should enter its order vacating the judgment of dis-
8	missal heretofore entered in this cause and allowing the
9	filing of the appellant's opening brief which has been
10	lodged with the Clerk of your Honorable Court.
11	Respectfully submitted,
12	TOIMI D. DDIMMED
13	JOHN R. BRUNNER Attorney for Appellant
14	CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL
15	I, John R. Brunner, certify:
16	I am the attorney for the appellant herein.
17	I verily believe that the appellant has good and just
18	cause for the presentation of the within appeal, that in my
19	judgment the within Petition for Re-Hearing is well-founded
20	and is not interposed for the purpose of delay, and that the
21	interests of justice and of the legal profession would be
22	served if the within petition is granted and the appeal
23	heard on its merits.
24	Executed at Long Beach, California, January 21, 1964.
25	JOHN R. BRUNNER
26	Attorney for Appellant
	-2-

